



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is not required, and that any rational cause is sufficient, such as to free one's self from the troublesome and unjust questions of another.

Many of Dr. Murray's examples, too, would cause very little embarrassment to a person who was ignorant of the doctrine that it is lawful to tell a lie when speaking the truth is inconvenient. In the case just mentioned, if Lord Palmerston or Lord John Russell were questioned as to the progress of negotiation or any other state secret, by one who had no right to put such a question, we fancy they would not find it necessary to resort to falsehood, in order to reduce the questioner to silence; or, in the next case, suppose a lawyer engaged in a case, and entrusted by his client with a weighty secret bearing closely upon it, were to be pumped by a cunning emissary from the other side, we do not think he would, in most cases, find much difficulty in his course of proceeding. Indeed in this case Dr. Murray's education in these countries has suggested to him an answer not to be found in Liguori. He says that it would be best—nay, would be a strict duty—to say in such cases, "Sir, your question is impertinent, and I will not answer it," or words to this effect, or to remain silent, if either line could be taken without serious inconvenience, or if silence were not equivalent to a revelation of the secret. We believe that the course of conduct suggested here would afford the clue to the greater part of Dr. Murray's difficulties.

We must hurry on, or we might touch on another disagreeable case which Dr. Murray propounds. Suppose we had some cash in hands, and were asked for the loan of twenty pounds by a man notorious for not paying his debts, but still whom it would be inexpedient to offend by a flat refusal, Dr. Murray rules that in such a case it would be quite lawful to deny that we have got so much money. The decision is, at least, convenient.

But we wish to give our readers a favourable specimen of Dr. Murray, and shall, therefore, lay before them the passage to which we before alluded, in which he expresses his own dislike to the habit of equivocation—

"It is evident that if such a practice were allowed, no man would trust his neighbour for a single moment. I could not be sure but that every fifth or tenth sentence I hear does not involve an equivocation; and as I know not in what particular sentence the trap is hidden, I know not in which I may be caught, and I suspect all. Social intercourse would resemble a journey on a dark night, over a road full of pitfalls. I am not sure when I may tumble in, but I have no doubt that I shall go down somewhere, and I fall into a state of feverish uneasiness, which continues to the end. In trying to scan the speaker's mind, the understanding loses its uprightness of attitude and directness of movement, and acquires a wriggling, shuffling, uneasy action. It gets a mean and dishonest turn, like a man who accustoms himself to peep round corners and listen at keyholes. Every motion of the equivocator's tongue becomes as much distrusted as the motion of a pickpocket's fingers. . . . A man who practises equivocation is always in the imminent danger of sheer lying. Lie he most certainly will from time to time; and the probability is, that, in the long run, the habit of equivocation will end in a habit of lying, as the habit of hard drinking often ends in a habit of downright drunkenness. . . . The habitual equivocator is both mean, despicable, and ten times more hateful than the habitual liar. The latter makes his choice 'for better for worse,' the former wags truth openly, and pays his secret addresses to falsehood, without intending to wed either. To insincerity he adds meanness and hypocrisy, and either of the latter is detestable in every aspect and every relation."

These extracts justify us in saying that Dr. Murray is a better man than his system; but, after all, what is this passage more than an expansion of Mr. Macaulay's assertion, that the world could not exist if men were generally to do what Jesuit divines have taught that with a good conscience they may do. Can a habit of equivocation be a bad thing, and the single acts of equivocation be all innocent? How are people to be taught that they may, with a safe conscience, practise acts of equivocation and yet be prevented from forming the habit. It is pretty plain that if Liguori's doctrines be true they are still not good for common ears, and that the less the public are taught of them the better. This is just Dr. Murray's judgment. He says—"The duty of observing strict veracity, and the sin and odiousness of lying, especially of habitual and deliberate lying, are certainly fit subjects for the pulpit; nor can the Christian preacher too strongly commend the one and repudiate the other. But if he does touch on equivocation he should reprobate it too; his plain and simple teaching should be condemnatory." And Dr. Murray cites, with approbation, the advice of an eminent divine—"To a person asking, is it lawful to use equivocation or mental reservation? the answer should be, it is not lawful." What! when Liguori, and all approved Roman Catholic divines, teach that equivocation for a just cause is perfectly innocent, and when Dr. Murray has written a long essay to justify the doctrine, will he still tell an inquirer simply that equivocation is not lawful? The force of equivocation can no farther go. With this equivocation on equivocation we take our leave for the present.

THE SUCCESSION OF THE POPES.

ONE of the marks of the true Church which eminent Roman Catholic writers lay down is "apostolicity;" a very good mark in itself, and one which we heartily wish all Roman Catholics rightly to understand.

Bishop Milner thus defines the mark "apostolicity"—"An uninterrupted series of successors of the apostles in every age since their time—that is to say, successors to their doctrine, to their jurisdiction, to their orders, and to their mission. Hence it follows, that no religious society whatever which cannot trace its succession in these four points up to the apostles has any claim to the characteristic title APOSTOLICAL."—End of Controversy, Letter xxviii.

It would seem that in applying this we must first know what the apostles' doctrine was, before we can learn what Church is apostolical by tracing its succession in doctrine. This appears to us to be very sound and agreeable to reason; but we are bound to say that it is not exactly what Bishop Milner meant.

But, independent of the truth of doctrine, there may be a difficulty in tracing the succession of doctrine. For instance, it would be difficult to trace a succession of Popes holding the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; because the present Pope is the first who has established that doctrine; so it would be unreasonable to expect in that point a succession in doctrine.

But there cannot be a succession in doctrine, or in anything else, unless there has been a succession of men. We propose, therefore, to begin at the beginning, and examine the succession of the Popes to each other.

We do not write either to under-rate or to exaggerate the importance of a succession of ministers in the Church wherever it can be shown (as it can in the Church of Ireland); we value and prize such an external manifestation and evidence of the perpetuity of the Church on earth. But where such an external manifestation is wanting, we do not therefore conclude that the continuity of the Church itself must have been broken, being entirely of the opinion of the learned Roman Catholic divine, Father Paul Sarpi, that Christ would have had a Church on earth, "although there should never more have been a Pope."—Treatise of Ecclesiastical Benefices, chap. 19.

It is, therefore, for the satisfaction of others, rather than for our own, that we undertake to trace the "succession of the Popes." Those Roman Catholics who are ready to stake the truth of the claims of their Church on the clearness of the succession of her Popes, may fairly expect to find the succession so clear that no Christian in any age could ever have had room to doubt who was the actual and lawful successor of St. Peter. If it should appear, as we proceed, that it has many times been a most puzzling question to find out the true successors, the fault is not in us, but in our materials; for we take our succession from the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in their great work on the Councils of the Church.

We pass over for the present the question, who succeeded St. Peter as Pope. Roman Catholic writers are fond of telling us that several ancient writers—Eusebius, Irenæus, Optatus, Tertullian, &c.—have given lists of the early Popes. But those Roman Catholic writers seldom quote the lists they speak of. The reason is, because the ancient lists differ from each other, and Roman Catholics do not know which list to choose.

It seems to us that if God had thought the succession of the Popes essential to the Church, he would have provided that we should know which list to rely on. If any Roman Catholic will give us a list of the first six Popes after St. Peter, we will discuss this subject further.

In the meantime, we proceed to consider the succession in after ages.

We know nothing which gives a better general view of the history of the Papacy, than the list of the Popes published by Labbe and Cossart in the "Concilia Generalia," vol. xvi., col. 130.

It is a simple list, stating the year in which each succeeded to the Papacy, and the time of his death.

Here and there a line is introduced, stating when two persons, or sometimes three or four persons, were claiming at the same time to be the successors of St. Peter.

We shall give each of these lines, prefixing the date preceding the schism.

- A.D. 251. "The first Antipope, Novatian, the Heretic."
- A.D. 366. "Felix II., so called by some."
- A.D. 367. "The second Antipope, Ursicinus."
- A.D. 418. "The third Antipope, Eulalius, the Archdeacon."
- A.D. 498. "The fourth Antipope, Laurentius, the Archdeacon."
- A.D. 530. "The fifth Antipope, Dioscorus."
- A.D. 686. "A schism, Peter and Theodore being elected."
- A.D. 687. "A schism, Theodore and Paschal being elected."
- A.D. 757. "A schism, on account of Theophylact, the Archbishop."
- A.D. 768. "Constantine, Antipope, brother of Toto, Duke of Nepi. (Here the Jesuits got tired of counting the Antipopes.)"
- A.D. 824. "Zinzimus gave occasion to a schism."

A.D. 844. "John, the Deacon, raised tumults against Sergius."

A.D. 847. "Here the POFESS Joan is absurdly inserted by some." (Note—The story of the woman Pope is told by Roman Catholic historians, not by Protestants.)

A.D. 890. "Sergius and Boniface VI. created tumults."

A.D. 896. "Romanus, the Galesian, intruded by force."

A.D. 963. "Leo VIII, the Antipope, put in by Otto."

A.D. 974. "Boniface VII., or Franco, Antipope."

A.D. 996. "John XVI., Antipope, by the faction of Crescentius."

A.D. 1013. "Gregory, the Antipope, is ejected by the Emperor."

A.D. 1048. "Silvester III., and John XX., the Archbishop of the Roman Church, Antipopes."

A.D. 1059. "John Mincius, called Benedict X., Antipope."

A.D. 1061. "Cadolaus, the Antipope, called Honorius II."

A.D. 1080. "Clement III., Guibert of Ravenna, Antipope."

A.D. 1099. "Guibert being dead, THREE Antipopes in a short time."

A.D. 1118. "Mauricius Burdinus, Archbishop of Braca, Antipope."

A.D. 1124. "Callistus II., Theobald, yielded to Honorius."

A.D. 1130. "Peter Leonis, Anacletus II., Antipope. Gregory, called Victor III., Antipope."

A.D. 1159. "Octavian, called Victor IV., Antipope Guido Cremensis, called Paschal III., Antipope.]

John the Abbot, called Callistus III., Antipope." (THREE Antipopes at one time was too much.)

A.D. 1268. "The See was vacant two years, six months, two days."

A.D. 1291. "The See was vacant two years, three months, two days."

A.D. 1313. "The See was vacant two years, three months, seventeen days."

A.D. 1378. "Robert of Geneva, called Clement VII., Antipope."

A.D. 1394. "Benedict XIII., Peter de Luna, Antipope."

A.D. 1415. "The Roman See was vacant two years, five months, ten days."

A.D. 1424. Ægidius, Antipope, called Clement VIII."

A.D. 1439. "Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, Felix V., Antipope."

The above is a plain story, from the highest Roman Catholic authorities, and needs few comments.

ANTIPOPE means "opposition Pope."

Our readers can count for themselves how often there have been "opposition Popes;" and how many "opposition Popes" there have been at a time.

If any one should suppose that it must have been always easy to see who was the true Pope, and who was the "opposition Pope," if he look carefully at the above list he will see his mistake.

Let him look to the year 890, in the above list, and he will see "Boniface VI." as a false Pope. Boniface VII. is set down as a false Pope in the year 974.

Boniface V. succeeded, in the year 617; Boniface VIII. in the year 1294.

There is no Pope Boniface VI. or Boniface VII., between them in the list of the Popes given in Bishop Milner's "End of Controversy."

How came this?

It could only happen in this way—Historians, writers, and people in general, reckoned Boniface VI. and Boniface VII. to be Popes; and, therefore, when another Boniface arose everybody called him Boniface VIII. This shows how commonly Boniface VI. and Boniface VII. were taken to be Popes.

If our readers will look over the list above given they will find that no less than eighteen of those who are now set down as "Antipopes" have numbers attached to their names.

There are no Popes of similar name and number in what is now counted the true list of the Popes.

For instance, there is a Pope John the 19th in the list of true Popes of the Church of Rome, and a Pope John the 21st; but there is no Pope John the 20th!

He who was counted Pope John the 20th while he was living, was put out of the list long after he was dead.

And so of all the other false Popes who have numbers to their names. They were counted Popes by multitudes while they were living, and were put out of the list long after they were dead, to try and make the list such as Roman Catholics would now wish it to have been.

The list, even now, might well be weeded a little more. There are worse weeds in it still than were ever cast out. But such weeding out in later times does little good to the multitudes who, in almost every age, were deceived by false Popes in their own day. The correction of such errors comes too late in after ages. If it be necessary to know the true Pope, men ought to know which he is while they are alive. There is no repentance nor knowledge in the grave.

Nor does there seem to be much hope in purgatory for those who were deceived by false Popes on earth. It does seem a case in which some mercy might be hoped for

because when two men were fighting for the Papacy, it was really hard to know at the time which Pope was the true successor, until it was seen which Pope beat the other; and some excuse, therefore, might be made for those who did not know the true Pope, until victory and the lapse of time had settled the list. Yet, we never heard of any victorious Pope doing anything for the souls of the followers of the conquered Pope, to get them out of purgatory.

It might have seemed a graceful and a generous act in a successful Pope, to grant an indulgence to all dead followers of his defeated enemy, by passing a Bull to let them all out of purgatory. But somehow it never was done. We can only account for it by supposing that the followers of all false Popes go direct to hell; and, therefore, nothing can be done for them in purgatory.

But this makes it more than ever necessary that every man while alive should know which is the true Pope—that is, if there be really any great difference between them, besides success and failure in the object of their ambition.

But those very awkward-looking gaps, in all modern lists, of Popes of the same name, afford conclusive proof that while the so-called "Antipopes" were living, men took them for true Popes, and called them Pope so long that it was hopeless in after times to alter the numbering of the list.

There must have been a total confusion in the public mind about those now called true Popes, and false Popes, at the time when it was most essential that the difference (if there really was such a difference) should be clearly understood.

It is quite evident that there was not any practical way of deciding at the time which of the rival claimants (if either) was the true successor of the apostle.

If our readers could know the crimes, the bloodshed, the confusion, and the misery to mankind, and the shame and disgrace to the Church of God, which have arisen from all the various disputes that have happened by reason of the rival claims to the Bishopric of Rome, they would feel more ashamed of "the succession of the Popes" than, perhaps, of anything else connected with the Church of Rome; they would see that the Papacy has not been a source of unity to the Church, but of war and bloodshed to Christendom.

We may give some of these sad histories hereafter. We have said enough now to put it to the consciences of religious Roman Catholics to consider whether the succession of the Popes has been such that they can with confidence point to it as a proof of the APOSTOLICITY of the modern Church of Rome?

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXXI.

"Jem," said Pat, "I wonder did God Almighty mean that the priests was to govern the country?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "it isn't likely; for didn't Jesus Christ say his kingdom was not of this world?" and if the priests are only the ministers of Christ, what business would they have governing the country? But what set you thinking of that, Pat?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I got another loan of the *Tablet* newspaper, and it's the greatest paper at all for telling a thumping bit of truth betimes. Maybe a man couldn't make out a newspaper if he hadn't a good bit of truth in his pocket, with a fine bag of lies beside it."

"Well, and what's in the *Tablet* now, Pat?" said Jem. So Pat pulled out of his pocket the *Tablet* of August 25th, and they fell to reading the great article in it; and Pat read out:—

"This country of ours is a Catholic country; the real constituents of it are the bishops and the priests; we take this for granted, and we do not see how it can be questioned. There are, of course, exceptions—places where lay influence predominates; but, on the whole, the Irish representation is the work of the priesthood. The Irish members are in Parliament because the priests have sent them there; they know it perfectly well, and the Protestants are not ignorant of it."

"Well, that's true anyway," said Jem; "sure it's the priest makes the member, and no mistake; but why does the people get the worst of it? What call have the people to it at all? Isn't it the poor case for them that has votes to be ordered one way by the agent and the tother by the priest? And where's the differ, only that no one gets beat at a fair or a market for voting again the agent? But wouldn't it be the fine thing if parliament would make a law that the priests would just send their own members without bothering the people at all, and getting them into trouble? I wonder is that what the *Tablet's* after? It would be the fine thing for the people anyway; sure it's the greatest of peace they would get."

"Well, it would be peace anyway," said Pat; "but that isn't what the *Tablet* set me a-thinking. Did God Almighty mean that the priests was to return the members?"

"Well," said Jem, "if the kingdom of Christ isn't of this world, what business would the priests have, only with the kingdom of heaven?"

"Well, it will be the great day anyway," said Pat, "when the clergy thinks of nothing only of getting the people to the kingdom of heaven, without harrasing about

elections. Maybe it is what Jesus Christ would like after all."

"Well, now," said Jem, "I'm thinking the clergy ought to keep to the kingdom of heaven. But I wonder how it is in foreign parts, and in America? Is it always the priests that returns the members?"

"Well, man alive," said Pat, "isn't that the very thing the *Tablet* tells us? Sure here it is; and so Pat read out of the newspaper—

"The Irish priests are also the ONLY priests in EUROPE or AMERICA who have such powers. . . . They can do in Ireland what the priests CANNOT do in France, Belgium, or Piedmont."

"Well, if that isn't something to know," said Jem; "and what call have they to it in Ireland, if they havn't it in any other part of the world? Sure it can't be no part of the religion of the Church of Rome at all!"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "it's little I'm caring now for what's part of the religion of the Church of Rome. Sure I want to get the religion of Christ. And did Jesus Christ mean that the priests was to have the power of returning the members of Parliament, and governing the country their own way?"

"Well, that's clear anyway," said Jem, "that he didn't mean that at all, when he said his kingdom wasn't of this world. But if the clergy could get us good members, what would stop them doing it?"

"Well, Jem, you omadhaun," said Pat, "sure isn't that what the *Tablet* is all about; just showing that the members the priests returns is the greatest set of villians and cheaters in all the Parliament! Sure here it is, that the members the priests sends to Parliament thinks of nothing but asking the government for 'judgeships, clerkships, and other favours.' And doesn't the *Tablet* 'beg to ask them whether they have not sacrificed not only the material interests, but even the spiritual welfare, of the poor Irishman, to their own political and personal convenience.' And now, Jem, isn't that enough to show that the priests is the worst at all to return the members for the country, when they send thinks of nothing but what they can get out of it for themselves, and cares nothing at all about the people?"

"Well, sure enough that's fit for the people to think about," said Jem. "But what's 'material interests,' anyway."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "sure that's the pratics or the meal we eat, and the bit of that on the roof that want's the new straw, or the rotten sticks that's breaking under it in every cabin you go into, and the stool that has lost the leg, and the old pot that's cracked, and the sod of turf that can't be got, and the window with the old hat that's stuck in it, and the door that won't keep out the cowl, and for the old blanket and the bed, we'll say nothing of them; them's the 'material interests,' Jem," said Pat.

"Oh, then, sure enough it's little the priest's member ever did for the 'material interests,'" said Jem. "Sure the Rev. Mr. Owens did more for that, anyway, when he gave me the blankets that's over the children. But what does the *Tablet* mean about the spiritual welfare of the poor Irishman? What did the priests' members do with that at all?"

"Well, then, Jem," said Pat, "I'm not quite clear about what they done with that; but, sure, here's what the *Tablet* lays the blame on them for; and so Pat read out of the paper—

"Ireland is not only losing her population, but the Church is losing that population in other lands. It is not merely that Irishmen emigrate bodily, but it is that Irishmen emigrate SPIRITUALLY. This is the question for the constituents."

"Them constituents, you know, is the priests', Jem," said Pat.

"Oh, then, I know what that means anyway," said Jem, "though I don't see what the members has to do with it; but I know what *emigrating spiritually* means well; sure isn't that what Father Mullin said in his letter,* that the Irish all turns Protestants in America?"

And with that Jem turned round on Pat, and got a grip of his arm, and, says Jem, "why wouldn't we both go to America, Pat, like so many of the boys that wants to turn?"

"Oh, Jem," said Pat, "don't talk about that; sure that's what's killing me. Sure I could go to America, and not be ashamed of Christ there, if the wife and childer would beg till I send for them; but why would I be afraid to confess Christ in IRELAND, and maybe have him ashamed of me; and don't talk of what's killing me, now anyway," said Pat.

So Jem allowed he wouldn't talk about it then.

"But if the priests' members is that bad," said Jem, "as the *Tablet* allows they are, does God Almighty mean that the priests is to return the members, and to govern the country?"

"Well, if the priests' members is the worst of all," said Pat, "sure that shows that God Almighty meant the priests to mind the kingdom of heaven, and let the people get the best members they could. But I'll tell you what, Jem," said Pat, "we'll have to talk about going to America, or speaking out like men in Ireland. And if they do, we shall have to tell it."

* For Father Mullin's letter, in which he calculates that 1,900,000 Roman Catholic emigrants have been lost to the Church since the year 1825, see the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., p. 103.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Backville-st. Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SEPTEMBER 15, 1855.

It is ever with a solemn sense of responsibility that we endeavour to convince our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, that many of their most cherished religious opinions are erroneous.

We are sensible that men who begin to doubt what they have long believed, may be in danger of allowing doubt to transgress its due limits; and believing an assured and settled faith to be of all things most precious to man, we feel the responsibility of any course that brings it into question.

At the same time we feel that no faith can be settled or secure which is not founded on the promise of God. Credulity has always ended in unbelief. Those who see, as many Roman Catholics cannot but see, that there are many impostures in their religion, must be ever in danger of taking religion itself for an imposture, especially if they observe that priests would rather countenance some manifest impostures, than submit the evidence of religion to examination.

We believe that in the long run faith will be preserved in the world by those who have sufficient faith in truth to be fearless in assaulting error. We, therefore, do not fear to urge our fellow-countrymen to reject whatever has no warrant from God, and no proof from reason; but, at the same time, we earnestly desire that they should keep before their eyes those great truths which all the efforts of Satan and his servants have never been able to shake.

"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God."—Psalm xiv. 1.

If there be found upon a road the simplest and rudest instrument which bears the marks of contrivance to answer a purpose, none but a fool will believe that the contrivance had no intellectual Being for its author.

He who looks upon the heavens by night, or the earth by day—upon the greatest or the least of the works and operations of nature—and does not see the evidence and handwriting of the Creator of all, is a fool past all reasoning with.

Yet this is the smallest part of the witness for God. He bears witness to HIMSELF. God is in the voice of conscience; in the sense of sin and fear, He makes His own Being FELT in the heart of man.

ALL men HAVE felt, that which no man would feel, if he could, the sense of SIN and GUILT. Man cannot hinder God from making His Being known in the heart of man.

That we have SOULS is proved by the mere fact that we are capable of a sense of sin and guilt. Mere animals have no such sense, and are not capable of it.

The immortality of the soul, and the reality of a life to come, is proved by the very fact, that man is a being capable of forming ideas, and of feeling hopes and fears respecting it. Man is capable of longings and desires which this world is NOT capable of satisfying. All nature proves that whatever desires God has made any living creature capable of forming, God has also provided somewhat capable of satisfying those desires.